Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*

Editorial Office 1323 M STREET, WASHINGTON 5, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066

VOL. VI, NO. 3, *Issue Number* 260, JANUARY 19, 1949 ★ *Editors:* FELIX MORLEY & FRANK C. HANIGHEN

JAN 21 1949

SIX FATAL BLUNDERS

by William Henry Chamberlin

The First World War produced a peace settlement, although one that was full of seeds of future wars. World War II has produced no settlement at all. The appointment of Dean Acheson, as the third Secretary of State to hold that office since the last war, makes it appropriate to examine the net accomplishment of our bi-partisan foreign policy.

A person who had gone into a Rip Van Winkle sleep on January 19, 1939, waking up today, would have a curious feeling of: "This is where I came in". He would again sense a mood of nervous waiting for the next move of an aggressive dictatorship. Only the location of the dictatorship, not the nature of the moves, would have changed.

The expansionist initiative that formerly belonged to Berlin and Tokyo is now concentrated in Moscow. The constant threat to world peace and stability is at least as serious. Admittedly, the Soviet Union is less efficient technically than Germany was. The many peoples who live under Soviet rule are less united in devotion to their system than were the Japanese. There was no equivalent either in Germany or in Japan for the mass surrenders of millions of troops which took place at the very beginning of the war in Russia, nor for the voluntary enlistment of hundreds of thousands of bitterly discontented Soviet subjects in the German armed forces.

On the other hand, Stalin possesses the advantages of a vast territorial base, the Heartland of which the British geo-politician Mackinder wrote. Stalin also commands a huge population and a much larger international fifth column than Hitler, Mussolini or the Japanese militarists ever controlled. Winston Churchill, who bears no small share of the responsibility for "bringing Asia to the Elbe", to use his own vivid phrase, recently admitted that the policy of appeasing Stalin had failed even before the end of the war. To quote Mr. Churchill:

> "The gulf which was opening between Asiatic Communist Russia and the Western democracies, large and small, was already brutally obvious to the victorious War Cabinet of the national coalition even before Hitler was destroyed and the Germans laid down their arms."

Churchill suggests that the United States and Britain should not have dispersed their armies so quickly, that British troops should have entered Berlin and American troops should have occupied Prague. But the

Copyright 1949 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blunders that lost the peace go farther back than these missed opportunities. One can recognize six conspicuous errors which in the aggregate produced a condition that is neither war nor peace.

II

These blunders, listed chronologically, were as follows:

(1) The guaranty of "all support in their power" which the British Government gave to Poland "in the event of any action which clearly threatened Polish independence". This guaranty proved impossible to implement. It was of no practical aid to the Poles in their unequal struggle against the German invasion. It was not even regarded as applicable against Russia in the case of the Soviet invasion of Poland, which was launched in full understanding and complicity with Hitler.

What the guaranty accomplished was to put Britain and France into war with Germany on an issue in which the Western Powers could not win. Even after the United States and the Soviet Union entered the war and Hitler was crushed, Poland was not liberated, but was subjected to totalitarian tyranny directed from Moscow. There is no proof and little probability that Hitler would have attacked the West if he had not been challenged on the Polish issue. The course of history would have been different, and much less favorable to Communism, if the first shock of Hitler's attack had fallen not on the West but on the Soviet Union; if the Western Powers, not the Soviet Union, had played the role of spectators during the first two years of the war.

How far American pressure was responsible for the British guaranty to Poland is hard to determine. There is fragmentary but interesting information in a German White Paper, based on material captured in Warsaw, indicating that American diplomacy was playing an active role behind the scenes, urging the British and French to assume a burden that was beyond their strength.

(2) The second major blunder was the unconditional surrender slogan tossed off by Roosevelt in a moment of casual improvisation at Casablanca, in January, 1942. This slogan was a godsend to Goebbels and was used over and over again in Nazi propaganda. As we know from the diary of Captain Harry C. Butcher, General Eisenhower's naval aide, Eisenhower and his military associates felt that this blankly negative slogan increased the human losses and intensified their difficulties.

"Unconditional surrender" was a tremendous damper on the German underground groups which were working against Hitler. As Allen W. Dulles comments in his book, The German Underground:

> "It sometimes seemed that those who determined policy in America and England were making the military task as difcult as possible by uniting all Germans to resist to the bitter end."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(3) We find the third blunder in the policy of "getting along" with Stalin on a basis of all-out appeasement, giving everything that was asked and asking nothing in return, not even an honest implementation of the Atlantic Charter, to the terms of which Stalin was a co-signatory, in regard to Poland and the Baltic States. This appeasement was a continuous, undeviating process, from the time when Hopkins first went to Moscow in the summer of 1941 until the same Presidential emissary made his last trip to the Soviet capital in June, 1945, and meekly swallowed the final insult: the treacherous arrest of fifteen Polish underground leaders.

As a result of this appeasement, which reached its high point at the Yalta Conference in February, 1945, our professed war aims, the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms, became a laughingstock. One wartime Ally, Poland, was reduced to the status of an outlying Soviet province. Chinese vital interests in Manchuria were sacrificed, without any consultation with China. The result there is now apparent to everyone, as the Soviet moves to take over all that Japan lost.

We were the givers, the Russians the recipients of lend-lease aid. Yet the following candid excerpts from a report by General John R. Deane, head of the American military mission to Moscow, to General Marshall, might almost suggest that the reverse was the case:

> "After the banquets we send the Soviets another thousand airplanes, and they approve a visa that has been hanging fire for months. We then scratch our heads to see what other gifts we can send, and they scratch theirs to see what else they can ask for . . . In short we are in the position of being at the same time the givers and the supplicants. This is neither dignified nor healthy for U. S. prestige."

(4) The fourth egregious blunder was adoption, by the United States and British governments, of the incredible Morgenthau Plan for the economic destruction of Germany. This was officially announced at the second Quebec Conference in September, 1944, where a communique was issued calling for the destruction of industries in the Ruhr and the Saar and the conversion of Germany, one of the most densely populated areas in Europe into "a country primarily agricultural and pastoral in character."

While the full insanity of the Morgenthau Plan (which called for the destruction of all mines in Germany) was never put into effect, enough of its vindictive spirit got into the Potsdam Agreement and the general functioning of American Military Government to work incalculable harm to American national interests and to European recovery. A belated effort to redeem something from this disaster is now under way.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(5) The curious miscalculation of the situation in the Far East was the fifth major blunder. In 1945 this found expression in overestimation of Japan's continued power of resistance and underestimation of the political undesirability of Soviet entrance into Manchuria and Korea. Captain E. M. Zacharias, naval language expert on Japan, who made effective broadcasts to that country in the last months of the war, expresses this opinion in his book, Secret Missions:

> "If the detailed interpretations of the unconditional surrender formula had been forthcoming in June rather than the end of July, the war would have ended without Soviet participation and before the dropping of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki."

(6) Last, but perhaps not least, was the hasty improvisation, amid much exaggerated ballyhoo, of the United Nations, without giving that organization either effective power to mediate and adjudicate in disputes between the major Powers, or a definite peace settlement to sustain. The result has been much like what would be expected if an architect should create an elaborate second story of a building, complete with balconies, while neglecting to construct a firm foundation.

These, I think, are proved blunders which no subsequent historical revelations and discoveries can explain away. No doubt there will be such revelations and discoveries, which may lead to a shifting judgment about some individual responsibilities. And it is easy to think of subsidiary causes which help to account for a political and diplomatic defeat of unexampled proportions, in spite of complete military victory.

President Roosevelt's mental and physical debility in the last year of his life was a far more serious handicap than is as yet generally realized. A strong, independent Secretary of State might have remedied this weakness. But in the last months of 1944 and the first months of 1945 the occupants of this office were the invalid Hull and the amateur Stettinius.

News and radio commentators during the war also bear a heavy responsibility for feeding the American people misleading information. The full story of Communist infiltration into policy-making and opinion-forming agencies of the Government has not yet been told. But the roots of our "defeat in victory", to use the apt phrase of Polish Ambassador Ciechanowski, are to be found in the blunders summarized above.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1323 M Street, N. W., Washington 5, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) and foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events January 19, 1949

By Frank C. Hanighen

DISMANTLING: European Recovery Administrator Paul Hoffman has thrown into the lap of incoming Secretary of State Dean Acheson a recommendation which will provide one of the first tests of the new Secretary's ability. Mr. Hoffman, relying on a report by American businessmen, has urged halting the dismantling of about 167 German plants. Details of this report, called the Humphreys report from the name of its chairman, have not been made public. But it is believed to contain the recommendation that the ceiling on German steel production be raised from the present 10.7 million tons annually to a proposed 13 million. (At present German steel production is running at the annual rate of about 7 million tons.) The Hoffman proposal, of course, will meet the bitter opposition of the British and French, intent on eliminating competition from Germany and on expanding their own exports. But, within the U. S. Government there will undoubtedly be even stronger opposition.

All the old Morgenthau-minded elements will undoubtedly try to put pressure on Acheson to set aside the Hoffman recommendation. These forces will be aided by the Government economists who are plumping for Government intervention in the American steel industry. If the German steel industry were contributing 13 million tons of steel annually to the world output, there would be no steel shortage in the United States, and no persuasive argument for a U. S. Government steel plant. Already supporters of the Morgenthau Plan in the press have tried to label the Hoffman proposal "partisan" because it arose from protests by the 80th Republican Congress against dismantling. We have said that Mr. Acheson is a "spender", a "New Dealer", in sympathy with planning, national and international. We shall be pleasantly surprised if he takes the side of Mr. Hoffman in this matter.

* * * * *

OIL: Important moves in the strategy of oil and steel are under way. In the case of the former, a wrangle is now going on in Government circles on the question: Shall we place our reliance on Mexico or Canada, for the imports of petroleum essential to fill out our needs in case of war? For the past two years, the Pentagon has been endeavoring to arrange matters so that the oil reserves of Mexico will be developed sufficiently, in case of another world conflict, to supplement U. S. output. Mexican production has long been at a standstill because of the inefficiency of the Mexican Government petroleum monopoly. Mexican oil laws and the reluctance of the Mexican Government to make an attractive offer to American oil companies have prevented any substantial progress towards increasing production. The U. S. Government's objective is really twofold -- to secure a petroleum supply, and at the same time to bolster political stability in a neighbor which in the past has not always been reliable.

Meanwhile a different sort of advice is presented to Washington: Why not drop the Mexican project and encourage the development of the seemingly important Alberta field. Canada, it is emphasized, is much more reliable politically than Mexico and its laws and policy towards business would help to stimulate a sizable output from the Alberta field, which is considered by some to be potentially comparable to the U. S. mid-continent pool.

If the United States would permit sufficient steel to go to Alberta, such a development might proceed rapidly; more wells would be drilled, pipe lines for both oil and gas would be laid down in Canada and possibly across the border into the

Copyright 1949 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

U. S. Assistance for Canadian oil would have another desirable effect -- the easing of the Canadian currency exchange situation. Canada, traditionally our best customer, has recently suffered from a shortage of dollars and has therefore had to curtail purchases in the United States. Sale of Alberta petroleum and products to customers on this side of the border would alter this dollar situation and promote Canadian buying in the United States. Obviously Washington faces a great question of oil strategy in this situation.

* * * * *

ATOMIC ENERGY: It would be premature to say that the activities of Mr. Lilienthal and his Atomic Commission are scheduled for an examination on Capitol Hill. But it is true that some Administration Members of Congress are very discontented with Lilienthal and his policies. They should have foreseen the present situation. Create a government agency and then surround it with inviolate secrecy regulations and you have a perfect setup for inefficiency, if not for worse matters. These Administration Members of Congress complain that the AEC will not give them information about how the atomic production is getting on. One member threatens to bring the whole matter up for review when the military budget of $15 billion is presented to Congress. He argues that, if the AEC has produced what it should, then $15 billion are not necessary. If it hasn't done so, he wants to know why. He is disturbed at reports that the whole process of atomic manufacture is marked by enormous waste and inefficiency. But he can get no illuminating explanation from Lilienthal and his organization.

These reports coincide with similar information which this column has received from sources in private industry. They say that there is an incredible waste of funds. The latter is allegedly the result of Lilienthal's management and the working of his personnel. Lilienthal is the archetype of New Deal bureaucrat, guided by the philosophy of "spend more". He is regarded as having little knowledge and no respect for the magnificent production capacity and "know how" of American industry. Lilienthal, to put it bluntly, is not an administrator; he is a publicist and politician. (This of course spells success for a bureaucrat.) He knows how to dictate releases and manipulate the media of propaganda. He knows how to obtain the support of powerful camarillas which manipulate political decisions. And he has built up a coterie which carries out his ideas in the Commission. The result is deterioration in the productive machinery. The worst aspect of the situation is that there is little chance of rectification. If Members of Congress should contemplate investigation and exposure, the Commission could probably end such plans merely by saying that Soviet Russia would profit thereby. It will, indeed, take some hardihood for members of the Senate Committee on Atomic Energy to tackle this problem.

* * * * *

ALLIANCE: On Friday, January 14, the State Department disclosed plans for the North Atlantic Defense pact, a real military alliance (and in peacetime, too), an unprecedented project in these United States. Very little critical examination has been given this proposal in the U. S. press. It would be well if the United States were to take note of the reaction in Canada. According to the New York Times of January 16, Canada regards the proposal for this pact with caution. "There has developed a public demand to know to what Canada has been committed and for a public debate on these commitments before the country is asked to accept a draft that may be quite unsatisfactory and at the same time impossible to refuse." The Times dispatch mentions that in all "her long and close association with Britain, Canada never signed, and never was asked to sign, such an obligation as it is believed the proposed North Atlantic pact will involve . . ." Nor has the Senate of the United States, in all its history.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It would seem that at least some Senators might well raise the following point. "The case of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement", says the dispatch from Ottawa, "which was negotiated in private and then thrust upon other nations such as Canada without the possibility of revision, is being cited as a warning and a flagrant contradiction of the Wilsonian democratic demand for 'open covenants openly arrived at'." The U. S. Senate might appropriately recall the intense and thorough indoctrination course through which the American people were put, at their own expense, preceding the submission of the UN Charter to the Senate. Well-informed critics were treated as "obstructionists", "isolationists", or worse, when they pointed out the impossibility of revision once the UN pact went into operation. Yet now, there are numerous organizations (members of which displayed a bigoted worship of the original pact) frantically and vainly seeking a way to revise it.

And what a commentary on an organization called "United" is the State Department release! That document relies heavily on the Rio Inter-American pact as a precedent. But the Rio pact is not aimed at any one other nation. The North Atlantic pact is openly directed at Soviet Russia. What validity remains to a body (mis-called United Nations) set up to maintain peace between the Member nations, when an alliance aimed at one of the two key Powers within its organization is proposed under the nominal aegis of the organization's charter?

* * * * *

HONEST MONEY: For some time we have been a bit fatigued with one prevailing metaphor used to describe inflationary measures. It is true that a hypodermic syringe filled with narcotic and applied -- again, and again, and again -- to a patient, has a descriptive value, particularly since the patient -- Society -- is sick. True, Society, in the present situation, does seem passive and will-less, lying prone while the doctors of the elite insert the needle and clap their hands over the toxic results. But a comparison which comes to us from a subscriber, Mr. Philip McKenna of Latrobe, Pennsylvania, seems fresher and more compelling. "The slow, insidious danger", he writes, "in irredeemable paper money has been likened to experience with the frog, which in its natural habitat responds energetically to many dangers, but may be readily killed by a danger which approaches gradually in an unaccustomed way -- namely, death by boiling. It is said that if a frog be placed in a vessel of water and the water placed on a stove and heated gradually, the frog at first becomes pleasantly relaxed in the warm water. And if the water be heated by slow degrees the frog will not jump out; the water may be heated to such a temperature by slow degrees that the frog is killed by parboiling, without having made a move to save himself. Americans must learn, and learn quickly, while there is still time to save themselves, the connection between gold redeemable money and human freedom."

* * * * *

EXPONENTIAL: This column has previously adverted, caustically, to the columnists who fashion a club, labelled "change at any price", and wield it on Members of Congress, conveniently labelled "reactionary". It would probably be too much to ask these scribes to stop and think. However, a book review in the current New Leader (hardly a "reactionary" organ) raises some questions which might induce a pause, if not thinking. Mr. James Rorty reviews Stuart Chase's The Proper Study of Mankind. Rorty remarks that "the social scientists have not as yet provided us with an economics that will really enable us to predict and order our economic affairs on either a national or international scale". Then Mr. Rorty gets down to the matter of change. "William F. Ogburn and others have provided us with something that looks like a 'law' of cultural change. It seems to follow the exponential curve of compound interest. Tools begot tools. The greater the accumulated technological resources of a culture, the more rapid its rate of change. But is this a good thing? What does this incessant uprooting do to people? What does it do to natural environment,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to our resources of soil and minerals? What happens when the Technological Imperative hits the Ecological Imperative invoked by William Vogt in his recent best-selling panic-maker?

"Chase, of course, is quite aware of this dilemma. 'It is a fearful thing', he writes, 'to be aboard an exponential curve -- something like an express train out of control. Ultimately such curves run off the map. A penny at compound interest blows up in a few centuries to a ball of gold the size of the planet. Nature often permits such curves to start, as in the multiplication of locusts and fruit flies, but she never maintains them for long. They always hit something and shrink with great suddenness. Are we going to hit something? . . .'

"Yet Chase accepts with equanimity Ogburn's assurance that it is not possible deliberately to hold the rate of material invention, the only practicable remedy being to pick up the social lag and encourage steeper curves in social analysis and social invention. But suppose the curve of technological advance continues to rise faster than the curve of the social sciences and their application? Since the answer to that one lies outside the competence of the social scientists there just isn't any answer -- or at least Chase offers us none."

* * * * *

NUREMBERG: From The New English Weekly (December 30, 1948) we cull the following statement by the German Roman Catholic Bishops, on the subject of the Nuremberg trials. We have not seen this text published in this country (and the Weekly reports that it has not appeared in England). "There seems to us", say the Bishops, "to be a grave danger that these trials will fail in moral effect. In the first place, there have already been numerous instances in which the conduct of the proceedings has been objected to as illegal. Further, the sense of justice has been scandalized by the impression that the courts set up flout the principle -- fundamental to all justice -- that 'everybody is equal before the law', and seem to assume the odious character of privileged courts. In the trials sentences have been pronounced in virtue of a body of special law which was promulgated by the victors exclusively for the German people and which has been applied exclusively to that people. The courts received their jurisdiction in the last resort from the London Agreement of 8 August, 1945, which, under Article 6 of the Charter of the International Military Tribunal, laid down rules for 'the punishment of war criminals'. In this Article 6, however, it is expressly stated that the rules shall hold only 'for the trial and punishment of the major war criminals of the European Axis countries'. As the laws found no application against Italians, they have in fact been restricted to Germany alone. Not only was the body of law under which German individuals were sentenced by the Nuremberg court hitherto unknown in Germany, but it is a body of law to which the nations who apply it to Germany are not prepared to submit themselves.

"The accused, in being thus incriminated under an ad hoc law, were placed in a highly questionable situation and under obvious disadvantages. To take only one point: in the trials ordinary citizens have been sentenced to heavy punishment because they had obeyed laws and ordinances which, even if contrary to the law of nations and to general moral standards, were yet those of their own country. The question whether or not a man ought to obey his own judgment or some international rule in preference to the orders of his government must be a very knotty one for human conscience, and no country has hitherto gone the length of cutting the knot for its own citizens, still less of prescribing penalties. But in the trials a group of men have been subjected to criminal prosecution on the ground that they had settled the knotty question wrongly according to the opinion of a court." Space does not permit the reproduction here of the rest of the Bishops' protest (drawn up at Fulda on August 26, 1948). But the whole text could well be widely published for educational purposes in the United States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European Supplement *to* Human Events

January 19, 1949

By Bertrand de Jouvenel

The year 1949 has begun in an atmosphere of mild optimism, and in fact the Western European scene presents quite a number of concrete justifications for this mood. Production is expanding and the output of steel in the 12 months 1948-49 is expected to be 50 per cent higher than in 1947 (though unfortunately the improvement in coal will be one of 14 per cent only). Governments are much improved over the raw, feverish and Communist-ridden teams of 1945: in France the moderate "Radicals" have returned to a dominant position, from which they have gently restored order and re-established civil liberties; Italy benefits from the high learning and humanity of President Einaudi and Count Sforza; England has been rescued from economic disaster and lifted back to a strong position under the firm leadership of Sir Stafford Cripps. Public opinion has simmered down: unreasonable hopes are abating and the poisons of class and international hatred are slowly dissolving. Reason is coming into its own.

Two reports have appeared in the last weeks which testify that common sense, at one time driven underground, can now speak up. The Queuille government has made public a report of the French Court of Public Accounts denouncing the depredations indulged in by some carpetbaggers of the Liberation. Up to this time those who had turned the national joy to their personal profit had managed to identify their evil cause with that of the French Resistance.

Another and more generally important piece of plain speaking is provided by the report of the European Secretariat for Economic Co-operation. It exposes frankly the wishful thinking which vitiates the national plans of the European participants. It excoriates the pretense that they can sell <u>to</u> each other $400 million worth more goods than they buy <u>from</u> each other, a discrepancy which emerged from a comparative examination of the plans. The Organization makes further cogent criticisms showing that common sense may now receive an official imprimatur.

But these symptoms of returning health have probably contributed less to the growth of optimism than have two major factors of world-wide import. One is the excellent harvest. Though man moves about in the air, so high and so fast that he cannot distinguish the earth-bound farmers, his life is still entirely dependent upon these providers of nourishment. Highly industrialized though we are, our whole economy still turns upon the harvest. Without good crops, there is no escape, other than the rationing strictly practised in England, from successive rounds of labor troubles and wage increases. The worker is forever seeking to better his table and to that end obtains wage increases which then compete for the available food and raise its price. Here is an unending spiral which only an increase in the food supply can stop.

The second factor, even more important, is that the fear of war has receded. The anxiety of last summer has been dispelled and seems in retrospect hysterical. It is now confidently asserted that there will be no war in 1949, and maybe not for years to come. The mood is favorable, though the main reason for it may not be entirely to our credit. Coming at the moment of the collapse of China, it is reminiscent of earlier moods of relief, following upon the betrayal of an ally. The distant sound of crunching, as a victim is eaten, brings comforting assurance that the ogre is busy elsewhere. Condemnation of "Chiang's corrupt government" solaces our moral sense. So too in the past, when we have left an associate to his fate, we have hurriedly emphasized all his bad points: an easy form of absolution.

Copyright 1949 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Soviet leaders would be mad indeed not to soften their policy in the West. Why run risks in this sector just as a whole continent, which has long been the goal of Russian ambition, is succumbing to their expansion? Some few signs of good will in Europe, and the Americans will be tolerant towards Communist progress in Asia. The Kremlin holds good cards in that respect. Provided they do not show their hand too openly in the troubles of Southern Asia, so that the local movements continue to wear an outwardly nationalist complexion, then anti-imperialist feeling in the United States and in Europe itself may be brought into play, and help to salt the ground for future sovietization. Attention should be paid to the Stalinist theory: National liberation in the case of colonial peoples entrusts power to a small ruling class, estranged from the masses both by its wealth and by its acquired Western culture. No middle class exists nor even any mechanically educated body of workmen. So representative government cannot be established and a revolt of the masses can easily be engineered to oust the weak national governments.

* * *

While everything seems to play into the hands of Russia, in Asia, the European situation must be a headache for the Kremlin leaders. Whatever trouble the inevitable resurgence of the German nation may hold in store for France, it seems by now plain that it will alter the balance of power to Russia's disadvantage. If Russia hoped to draft Germany into her camp, this chance seems lost and the best Moscow can now do is to retard the restoration of Germany, playing for that purpose on the painful memories and traditional fears of France. Also Russia can use the memory of Nazi domination in Central and Eastern Europe, to weld together the "satellites", reminding them that the Western Powers proved incapable of protecting and even of liberating them from Germany.

If the course of events seems to push Germany increasingly into the Western camp, there is unfortunately little sign that Western European Union will have progressed quickly enough to be ready for the reception of Germany into a prepared framework. The affairs of Western Union are not going smoothly, although the idea has received the assent of a majority of members of the parliaments of France and Italy and notwithstanding the remarkable popular efforts in its behalf.

The obstacle is said in Paris to be imposed by England. It is felt here that Mr. Walter Lippmann admirably expressed the British disposition when he wrote: "The British nation has, I am convinced, come definitely to the decision -- after much debate and searching of soul -- that it does not feel itself to be a European nation and that its vital interests do not lead it to enter into a European system." There is ample circumstantial evidence to corroborate that view; such as, to cite only one instance, the obvious anxiety of the British Government to achieve a perfect balance of payments with its Continental associates, thus in fact separating its own balance of payments problem from ours.

Yet I think, or hope, that Mr. Lippmann is unduly pessimistic and takes a short-term disposition for a long-term choice. It is true that the English, who are consenting to great sacrifices to restore their position, do not want these sacrifices wasted by the fault of their associates, who are not, they feel, making a comparable effort. They compare the restriction by one-fifth of their pre-war imports with the increase of one-fifth in the French imports. They compare the attitude of their bourgeoisie, which submits to the burden of a decreased national consumption, allowing the workers an improved standard of life (except in the matter of food), with the attitude of the Continental bourgeoisie, eager, they say, to evade taxation by fraud. The English do not believe in the will to defense on the part of the European nations and they are afraid to commit their forces to common effort on the Continent, for they regard it as doomed in advance and anticipate hav-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing to rescue any expeditionary force, after disastrous losses, as in the days of Dunkirk. In fact, to cut it short, the English feel that they are being good boys, and that the French are not.

While this sentiment, for which there is some justification, is fairly general, it is only carried to its extreme by the least cultured and the least understanding. It is surprising to find Foreign Minister Bevin in this category, but he did let slip a most regrettable remark in the House of Commons, indicating that the further import of French books, pressed for by Mr. Eden, suggested to the Bevinian mind fresh supplies of pornographic literature. But to regard such an attitude as lasting is, I believe, to underestimate completely the influence which the British cultural elite is capable of exerting upon the affairs of that country. A term I have just spent in England has left me deeply impressed by the intellectual activity displayed across the Channel. It is unbelievable that a country where the problems of today are being thought out so diligently will fail to resume its eminent place in European leadership.

Perhaps one of the factors which turn the British, or some of them, away from the Continent is the vagueness of the constructive views which are put forward. This they can help to remedy. Another factor, and perhaps the chief one, is that they are repelled by the part hatred plays in the politics of the Continent. They do not want this poison to be slipped into their blood. From country to country and within the same country, the Continental Europeans detest each other for past evils, real or imaginary. To many Europeans, the German is an invader and the oppressor of yesterday. But also one's own compatriot is possibly an "informer" either of the Occupation period or of the Epuration period, or again an informer <u>in posse</u> under the coming dispensation of Communism or Reaction. Patriotism is too often a man's love of an abstract image of his country against which he measures his compatriots, finds them wanting and detests them in the name of the very love he bears to his country, or to his own image of his country. As against this the English do have for each other a mutual toleration which gives life and blood to their patriotism. Professor Michael Polanyi writes most movingly: "On Christmas Day, listening to the King's broadcast in an English home, I was impressed by this reign of love and the happiness it brings to this country."

It is this reign of love which must be extended to all Western Europe and which must prevail over the disruptive forces of hatred if the new political formation is to take shape: A constitutional body is futile if it has no soul.

* * *

Whoever speaks of spiritual forces risks classification as unrealistic. But in truth nothing can be more unrealistic than to expect Western Union to be achieved by political means and under the motivation of a common interest. Our interests, which are always apprehended in the short view, rather oppose than unite us. We compete for the grant of American dollars; we compete for the procurement of raw materials. The European Organization has very properly warned us that the world market for manufactures, which has apparently not expanded since 1913, may prove unable to absorb, on top of American exports, the $9 billion worth of industrial goods we plan to sell by 1952 outside Europe and the U. S.

This gives occasion to think that between Europe and the U. S. and between the European exporters themselves, conflicts of interests will arise. The reappearance of German exports will certainly prove a cause of friction. Overall advantage will not reconcile us: already the proposed customs union between France and Italy has evoked an adverse vote of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the French Chamber. Nor will even the most vital interest unite us; that of common defense. For if Soviet attack is feared by a majority, it is hoped for by a strong minority in both France

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Italy. And this minority sees national defense as a plot to destroy the fatherland of all workers. Reason by itself is powerless to overcome the resistance of prejudices and vested interests. There must be a sense of fellowship.

I have always felt that the tardiness of the European nations in absorbing the homeless deportees was not only a bad thing but a bad omen, displaying a lack of helpfulness, a disposition to close one's door in the face of misfortune which boded ill for Western Union. If this is to be achieved, we must be willing to take in poorer relations, former enemies and temperamental neighbors. And no one is going to do that except from an impulse of love. The problem then is far less a problem in constitutional adjustment than it is a problem in conversion. And that seems to be a matter for the churches and the intellectuals. The latter, especially, must cease to lend their talents to the justification of hatred, a cause to which they have greatly prostituted them. Probably a major crime of the century is the misuse of history, of the philosophy of history, of economics, and of sociology, to foster group hatred. Those, whatever their opinions and aims, who indulge in such practices, are the witches of today. As our principles entirely preclude that they should be silenced, they must be converted. That is the very first step towards European Union.

* * *

A major failing of our times is an exaggerated belief in historical trends, which blinds us to the power of a good man. For that reason I think I am justified in noting here the career of my friend, Cudenet, who passed away at Christmas. Twenty years ago, when his great voice was first heard in Radical-Socialist Conferences, many smiled at what they regarded as over-emphasis. His was a mind full of the noble deeds of history. That is, he took Clio in the old manner, that of Plutarch, not as the realm of blind social forces but as the scene on which great men behave as men should. This education served him well: he blossomed out a brave man under the Occupation and after the Liberation, when a great baying began, he did more than any other single person to stay the furies. He just spoke as himself and as the heroes of classical tragedy. And opinion was swayed by his great voice in a manner surprising to all but to himself. He rose to the leadership of the Radicals and their associates in the Assembly by unanimous consent.

Cudenet died of heart failure and, in the grand manner of his models, on his deathbed he dictated to his family a glowing testimonial to his old friend, Gaston Bergery, who is prosecuted, as Cudenet thought unjustly, for having been sometime an Ambassador of Vichy. The dead man accomplished beyond his life yet another and momentous act of national reconciliation. He had ordained a religious funeral and the whole government attended it at the Church of the Madeleine. More than that, the speeches for which the Radical-Socialist Party attended in force were delivered under the porch of the church. Those who know the traditional fight of the Radicals against the Church can measure the importance of the event. The Madeleine was filled with the whole figuration of a Radical Conference, a majority of those present having never entered a church since their childhood.

* * *

This Supplement has often discussed the growth of the Gaullist movement. I have said nothing about it recently as its destinies seem to depend a contrario on the success or failure of the present French government. But recently I have been made aware of a remarkable development. In Belgium, Italy and Germany, there is apparently a Gaullist following in the sense that some look to a formation of Europe without England, and led by the General. This strange idea is, of course, linked to the anti-English feeling which is being stirred up on the Continent and which seems puzzlingly to come from many angles, from the former followers of Maurras, from the Communists, from the Zionists, etc. As there is no solid ground for this feeling, I am not disposed to attach much importance to it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED